Effectiveness of Non-pharmaceutical Interventions to Contain COVID-19: A Case Study of the 2020 Spring Pandemic Wave in New York City

Wan Yang,[1*] Jaimie Shaff,[2] Jeffrey Shaman[3]

[1]Department of Epidemiology, Mailman School of Public Health, Columbia University, New York, NY, USA; [2]New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, New York, NY, USA; [3]Department of Environmental Health Sciences, Mailman School of Public Health, Columbia University, New York, NY, USA

Correspondence to:

Wan Yang

Department of Epidemiology

Mailman School of Public Health

Columbia University

722 W 168th Street, Room 514, New York, NY 10032

Phone: (212) 305-0421

Email: wy2202@columbia.edu

Abstract

As COVID-19 continues to pose significant public health threats, quantifying the effectiveness of different public health interventions is crucial to inform intervention strategies. Using detailed epidemiological and mobility data available for New York City and comprehensive modeling accounting for under-detection, we reconstruct the COVID-19 transmission dynamics therein during the 2020 spring pandemic wave and estimate the effectiveness of two major non-pharmaceutical interventions—lockdown-like measures that reducing contact rates and universal masking. Lockdown-like measures were associated with >50% transmission reduction for all age groups. Universal masking was associated with a ~7% transmission reduction overall and up to 20% reduction for 65+ year-olds during the first month of implementation. This result suggests that face covering can substantially reduce transmission when lockdown-like measures are lifted but by itself may be insufficient to control SARS-CoV-2 transmission. Overall, findings support the need to implement multiple interventions simultaneously to effectively mitigate COVID-19 spread before the majority of population can be protected through mass-vaccination.

Keywords: COVID-19; transmission dynamics; effectiveness of intervention; social distancing; lockdown; face covering

Introduction

Since the emergence of SARS-CoV-2 in late 2019, the virus has infected over 79 million people and killed over 1.75 million worldwide by the end of 2020 (as of 12/27/20).[1] Non-pharmaceutical interventions such as social distancing and face covering have been the

43 main strategies to contain COVID-19 during this pandemic in 2020. In late 2020, Phase-III
44 trials for several SARS-CoV-2 vaccines showed highly promising results and were granted
45 emergency use in several countries.[2,3] However, before these vaccines become widely
46 available to the general population (likely in mid- or late 2021), non-pharmaceutical
47 interventions will need to remain the main strategies to contain COVID-19. In addition,
48 future (re)emerging infectious disease outbreaks may need to rely on similar non-
49 pharmaceutical measures. It is thus critical to understand the effectiveness of different
50 non-pharmaceutical interventions implemented during the COVID-19 pandemic waves in
51 order to inform effective future planning while balancing economic need. For instance,
52 with face covering and social distancing by closing businesses as two main interventions,
53 the more effective face covering is, the more businesses could remain open. As a simplified
54 calculation, with a basic reproductive number (R_0) of 3 and minimal immunity, a city could
55 maintain 55% business capacity while curbing epidemic growth, if its residents could
56 reduce transmission by 40% using face covering [ie, effective reproductive number $R_t = 3 \times$
57 $55\% \times (1 - 40\%) = 0.99 < 1$]; this threshold business capacity would drop to 33% if no
58 residents used face covering.
59
60 However, assessing the effectiveness and impact of a given intervention for COVID-19 has
61 been challenging due to low infection detection rates (many asymptomatic and mild
62 infections do not seek care or receive testing),[4] fluctuation of those infection detection
63 rates, differential disease manifestation by age group,[5,6] and concurrent public health
64 interventions. As such, while a few studies have assessed the overall effectiveness of

65 lockdown-like measures, to date, the effectiveness of specific measures including face
66 covering *under real-world conditions* remains unclear.
67
68 To estimate the effectiveness of different non-pharmaceutical public health interventions,
69 here we thus focus on the 2020 spring COVID-19 pandemic wave in New York City (NYC),
70 the first COVID-19 epidemic center in the United States, where detailed data are also
71 available. NYC experienced widespread COVID-19 transmission citywide since early March
72 and recorded over 200,000 cases and over 21,000 COVID-19 confirmed or probable deaths
73 during the following three months. To curb this intense transmission, NY State and NYC
74 implemented multiple intervention measures, including health promotion campaigns in
75 early March, telecommuting and staggered work schedule recommendations beginning the
76 week of March 8, public schools closure starting the week of March 15,[7] stay-at-home
77 orders for non-essential workers starting the week of March 22,[8] and requirements for use
78 of face covering in public starting the week of April 12.[9] With these overlapping and far
79 reaching public health interventions, case diagnoses and hospitalizations peaked in April,
80 and started to decline substantially in late April and May. NYC was able to begin its phased
81 re-opening of industries starting the week of June 7, 2020.
82
83 In this study, we apply a model-inference system[10-12] developed to support the city's
84 COVID-19 pandemic response to reconstruct the underlying transmission dynamics of
85 COVID-19 in NYC during March 1 – June 6, 2020 (i.e. prior to the city's reopening). To
86 address the aforementioned challenges, our model-inference system simultaneously
87 assimilates three sources of data: 1) confirmed COVID-19 case data, 2) COVID-19

88 associated death data (both cases and deaths are assimilated by neighborhood and age
89 group), and 3) neighborhood-level mobility data to constrain the model system. This
90 enables inference of the overall infection rate (i.e. including those not documented by
91 surveillance), estimation of key transmission characteristics (e.g., the reproductive
92 number) through time, and assessment of the effectiveness of different public health
93 interventions, including social distancing and face covering, implemented over time. We
94 further incorporate these estimates to project cases and deaths in the weeks beyond our
95 study period and compare the projections to independent observations in order to evaluate
96 the accuracy of these estimates. We conclude with a discussion on the implication of our
97 findings on strategies to safely reopen economies in places COVID-19 continues to pose
98 substantial public health threats.
99

100 **Results**

101 ***Overall Epidemic Trends***

102 Following diagnosis of the first case in NYC, confirmed COVID-19 cases in the entire
103 population increased nearly exponentially during the first three weeks (Fig 1B) before
104 slowing down beginning the week of March 22, 2020 when NYC implemented a stay-at-
105 home order. However, case trajectories differed substantially by age group. Foremost,
106 reported cases increased with age: the case trajectory for those aged 25-44 years mirrored
107 the overall epidemic curve, those older than 45 years had higher case rates, and those
108 under 25 years had the lowest case rates (Fig 1A and Table S1). Infants (i.e. <1 year),
109 however, had higher case rates than 1-4 and 5-14 year-olds (Fig 1). In addition, the timing
110 of peak case rate was mixed. Case rates in 25-44, 45-64, and 65-74 year-olds peaked

earliest during the week of March 29, 2020, followed by <1, 1-4, 15-24, and 75+ year-olds with a 1-week lag; in comparison, the case rate for 5-14 year-olds fluctuated with a less clear peak during the weeks of March 29 – April 26, 2020.

The epidemic trends based on diagnosed cases, however, were obscured by varying infection detection rates by age and through time. COVID-19 infections are more likely to manifest as symptomatic illness and/or more severe disease in individuals with underlying conditions and in older adults.[5,6] Such differential clinical characteristics by age thus lead to varying healthcare seeking behaviors and infection detection rates by age. In addition, testing policies varied over the course of the Spring 2020 COVID-19 pandemic in NYC. During this time, testing capacity was limited at the federal, state and local levels by guidelines for who should be tested (due, for example, to limited availability of test kits, swabbing supplies and reagents), which required prioritizing testing for severely ill patients and those highly vulnerable to severe disease. Testing capacities expanded during the week of March 8, 2020;[13] however, by late March, material shortages (including testing kits and personal protective equipment) again prompted the city to restrict testing to those severely ill.[14] Using our model-inference system, we estimated that infection detection rates increased in early March, reaching a peak of around 20% for all ages overall during the week of March 15, and declined afterwards before increasing again in mid-April.[11,12]

After accounting for infection detection rates to include undiagnosed infections, a different picture of the NYC spring outbreak emerges (Fig 2 and Fig S3). Estimated infection rates were highest among 25-44 and 45-64 year-olds (Fig. 2 F and G), followed by 65-74 and 75+

134 year-olds (Fig. 2 H and I), then 5-14 and 15-24 year-olds (Fig. 2 D and E), and were lowest
135 among <1 and 1-4 year olds (Fig. 2 B and C; Table S1). Estimated infection rates in the
136 younger age groups (in particular, 5-14, 15-24, and 25-44 year-olds; Fig. 2 D-F) peaked
137 during the week of March 22, 2020, followed by the three older age groups (i.e. 45-64, 65-
138 74, and 75+ year-olds; Fig. 2 G-I) about a week later.
139
140 Given the large uncertainties in model estimates, we verified our estimates of infection
141 rates using available serology data collected during three phases of the pandemic (i.e.
142 early-phase in March,[15] mid-phase in April,[16] and end of the pandemic wave in June[17]).
143 Overall, our estimated cumulative infection rates were in line with corresponding
144 measures from antibody tests, for all three phases of the pandemic wave (for details, see
145 the Appendix of Yang et al. 2020[11,12])
146
147 ***Overall effectiveness of interventions***
148 The reproductive number at time-t (R_t) measures the average number of persons an
149 infected individual infects and thus reflects underlying epidemic dynamics. The epidemic
150 expands in size if R_t is above unity and subsides otherwise. In addition, when the entire
151 population is susceptible and no interventions are in place, R_t, referred to as the basic
152 reproductive number (R_0), reflects the transmissibility of an infection in that population.
153 Here we estimated that R_t was 2.99 [median and interquartile range (IQR): 2.32 – 3.86;
154 Table S2] during the first week of the pandemic (i.e. the week of March 1) in NYC, similar to
155 R_0 estimates reported for other places.[18,19] It decreased to around 2.2 during the next two
156 weeks, when NY State declared a state of emergency and public awareness and voluntary

157 precautionary measures (e.g. avoiding public transit[20]) increased (Fig 2A). Following the
158 stay-at-home mandate starting the week of March 22, R_t dropped substantially to 1.37
159 (IQR: 1.08 – 1.68) during that first week, to 0.93 (IQR: 0.73 – 1.13) a week later, and to a
160 minimum of 0.56 (IQR: 0.45 – 0.67) during the week of April 12 (Fig 2A). These prompt
161 decreases in R_t from mid-March to mid-April indicate that implemented public health
162 messaging and interventions were effective in curtailing COVID-19 transmission.
163
164 Similar decreases in R_t occurred among most age groups (Fig 2 B-I). Overall, R_t among
165 younger age groups (<45 years) decreased one or two weeks earlier than older age groups
166 (45-64, 65-74, and 75+; Fig 2 C-F vs. Fig 2 G-I). Of note, among the four age groups with
167 higher contact rates[21] (i.e. 5-14, 15-24, 25-44, and 45-64 year-olds), R_t dropped below 1 the
168 earliest among 5-14 year-olds (0.99, IQR: 0.74 – 1.30; Table S2) during the week of March
169 22. This is consistent with the earliest public health interventions to this age group: the
170 closure of public schools beginning the week of March 15.[7]
171
172 ***Effectiveness of reducing contact via school closure and voluntary or mandated stay-***
173 ***at-home measures***
174 Several public health interventions were implemented around the same time (Fig. 2), and
175 some interventions may take longer to produce an effect (e.g., due to slower compliance
176 with the measure). It is thus challenging to separate the impact of different interventions.
177 However, a number of measures – including voluntarily working from home during the
178 early weeks of the pandemic, school closures, and the stay-at-home mandate – in effect
179 reduce rates of close in-person contact, a key factor for COVID-19 transmission. Thus, here

we focus on estimating the impact of interventions whose primary mechanism of action is through a reduction in population contact rates. Given the difficulties measuring this quantity directly, we instead approximated population contact rates using human mobility data, which record real time population movement based on location changes of individual mobile devices (see Data). Indeed, the reduction in R_t mirrored the reduction in mobility (Fig 3). The Pearson correlation (r) between R_t and mobility over the 14-week study period was 0.96 for all ages overall and ≥0.9 for 1-4, 5-14, 15-24, and 25-44 year-olds (Table S3). Thus, we focused on mobility as a proxy for contact rates and used this quantity to estimate the corresponding changes in R_t and segregate the impact of interventions that reduce population contact rates from other concurrent interventions.

Mobility reduced by 11.6% during the second week of the pandemic in NYC (i.e. the week of March 8), and by a further 33.5% and 17.3% in the following two weeks, respectively (Fig 3). Using observed mobility data (i.e. our proxy for population contact rates) to estimate the corresponding changes in R_t, we estimate that, for all ages overall, reductions in population contact rates were associated with R_t reductions of 10.1% (95% CI: 8.3 – 11.9%) by the second week of the pandemic, and another 29.2% (95% CI: 24.9 – 33.5%) and 15.0% (95% CI: 14.3 – 15.8%) in the following two weeks, respectively (Fig 3A). By the week of April 12 when R_t reached its minimum, the reduction in population contact rates was associated with an R_t reduction of 70.7% (95% CI: 65.0 – 76.4%). In addition, analysis at the neighborhood level consistently showed large reductions in R_t that were likely due to reductions in population contact rates (range of median estimates: 66.1 – 90.1% across the 42 neighborhoods in NYC; Fig S4).

203

204 In addition, transmission in four age groups (i.e., 5-14, 15-24, 25-44, and 45-64 year-olds)
205 appeared to be most impacted by changing population contact rates (Fig 3 and Table 1).
206 The reduction in population contact rates was associated with decreases of the age-specific
207 R_t by 83.4% (95% CI: 80.1 – 86.7%) for 5-14 year-olds, 65.4% (95% CI: 57.0 – 73.8%) for
208 15-24 year-olds, 76.5% (95% CI: 68.5 – 84.6%) for 25-44 year-olds, and 68.9% (95% CI:
209 59.2 – 78.6%) for 45-64 year-olds, by the week of April 12.

210

211 ***Effectiveness of face covering/masking under real-world conditions***

212 Estimated transmission rates (or probability of infection) and the infectious period also
213 closely tracked changes in mobility (Table S3; $r \geq 0.5$ for most age groups). Thus, it appears
214 that reducing mobility not only reduces contact rates but also likely reduces 1) the
215 probability of transmission per contact due to, e.g., increased public spacing and 2) the
216 effective infectious period per infected individual due to, e.g., more time spent at home and
217 as a result reduced time for community transmission despite likely unchanged duration of
218 viral shedding. Given this observation, we hypothesize that the relationship between
219 mobility and estimated transmission rates (and effective infectious period) can be used to
220 disentangle the impact of interventions that reduce population contact rates (particularly,
221 the stay-at-home mandate) and face covering/masking — two major public health
222 interventions implemented in NYC during the pandemic — on transmission. We make two
223 predictions if this hypothesis holds. First, predicted transmission rates (infectious period)
224 using mobility data alone would be higher (longer) than those estimated by the model-
225 inference system additionally based on case and mortality data *for weeks when face*

226 *covering in public was mandated* as it would lead to further reductions in transmission (i.e.,
227 temporality and direction of the impact). Second, while the efficacy of masking (i.e.,
228 measured under ideal conditions of mask quality and correct use) likely does not vary by
229 individual, the effectiveness of masking (i.e., measured under real-world, often imperfect
230 conditions) and impact of this intervention could vary by subpopulation due, for example,
231 to different usage rates of masks; as such, we expect the predictive errors to be larger for
232 age groups with higher compliance of masking (i.e., magnitude of the impact). Our analyses
233 largely confirmed both predictions. For the first, as shown in Fig 4, transmission rates
234 predicted using a linear regression model with the observed mobility as the sole predictor
235 were higher than those estimated by the model-inference system, following the face
236 covering mandate starting the week of April 12.[9] For the latter, the discrepancies in the two
237 model estimates (i.e. the gaps between the dashed and solid blue lines; Fig 4) appeared to
238 increase with age and were largest among the two elderly age groups who have been
239 reported to more frequently use masks.[22-24] However, infants (<1 year) appeared to have a
240 larger reduction than other children groups; this could have been due to transmission
241 reduction related to their sources of infection (e.g. their caretakers and healthcare settings
242 where they tended to be exposed). Similar patterns held for the effective infectious period
243 (Fig 4).
244
245 Given these observations, we further used the discrepancies in the two model estimates to
246 approximate the impact of face covering on reducing COVID-19 transmission. Combining
247 the reduction in the transmission rate and effective infectious period, we estimated that,
248 for all ages combined, face covering contributed to a 6.6% (95% CI: 0.8 – 12.4%) reduction

249 during the first month it was implemented and a 3.4% (95% CI: -1.9 – 8.6%) reduction over
250 the entire 8 weeks prior to the city's reopening (Table 1). As expected, the estimated
251 impact varied substantially by age group. The effectiveness was 20.8% (95% CI: -0.1 –
252 41.6%) for 65-74 year-olds and 20.8% (95% CI: -0.9 – 42.5%) for 75+ year-olds during the
253 first month and remained at similar levels afterwards. For 25-44 and 45-64 year-olds, two
254 age groups with the highest infection rates (Fig 2), the effectiveness was 4.5% (95% CI: -0.6
255 – 9.7%) and 8.1% (95% CI: -0.1 – 16.1%) in the first month, respectively; however, it
256 reduced substantially afterwards, likely due to reversed risk behavior. Of note, in addition
257 to the likely lower usage rate of face covering in late May – early June, increases in risky
258 behaviors such as large gatherings at the time[25] may have partially obscured the
259 effectiveness of masking.
260
261 ***Retrospective projections of cases and deaths***
262 NYC started phased reopening from the week of 6/7/2020, which allows industries to
263 gradually reopen per a four-phase plan.[26] For instance, manufacturing industries were
264 allowed to reopen starting the week of 6/7/2020 (dubbed "Phase 1"), whereas real estate
265 was allowed to reopen starting the week of 6/21/2020 (dubbed "Phase 2"), and personal
266 care services were allowed starting the week of 7/6/2020 (dubbed "Phase 3"). As such,
267 population mobility has increased gradually during this time, which could lead to increased
268 transmission of unknown magnitude. Such changes also offer an opportunity to test the
269 accuracy of our estimates – should the estimated effectiveness of reducing contact rates
270 and utilizing face coverings be accurate, these estimates could be used to anticipate
271 changes in transmission in response to the changing mobility and in turn the epidemic

272 dynamics after reopening. We thus used these estimates to generate projections of cases
273 and deaths for the 8 weeks beyond our study period, and compared the projections to
274 available, independent corresponding observations. Overall, our projections
275 underestimated the total number of cases (relative error of median projections: -27% over
276 8 weeks; Fig 5A) but were able to accurately estimate the total number of deaths (relative
277 error: -2% over 8 weeks; Fig 5B). In addition, examination of age-grouped projections
278 shows that the underestimation of cases was mostly among younger age groups whose
279 case rates had increased in June (1-4, 5-14, 15-24 and 25-44 year-olds; Fig S5). These
280 recent increases in young cases may have resulted from more young adults returning to
281 work including some in service industries with high contact rates and, relatedly, sending
282 their children to childcare and/or summer camps due to a lack of caretakers at home
283 [information from NYC Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (DOHMH) community
284 investigation; unpublished]. In addition, increased risk behaviors of some young
285 individuals (e.g., large parties without physical distancing[25]) may have also contributed to
286 the increased cases among young adults in late June.[27] Consistently, COVID-19 associated
287 mortality, mostly occurring among older adults continued to decrease and were accurately
288 predicted for different age groups (Fig S6).
289

290 **Discussion**

291 The spring 2020 pandemic wave in NYC, the first epidemic center in the US, provides a test
292 case to study COVID-19 epidemiological characteristics and the effectiveness of public
293 health interventions. Through comprehensive modeling, we have reconstructed the
294 transmission dynamics and estimated the effectiveness of two major interventions, social

295 distancing and mandatory face covering in public. Our results show that reducing contact
296 rates (mainly via school closures and voluntary or mandated stay-at-home measures) likely
297 contributed to the largest reduction in transmission in the population overall (~70%) and
298 for most age groups (>50% for all age groups). Widespread use of face covering likely
299 contributed to an additional ~7% overall reduction and up to ~20% reduction among 65+
300 year-olds during the first month face covering was mandated in public places. Our findings
301 largely consolidate previous model estimates on the impact of lockdown-like
302 measures[4,28,29] and studies on face covering in reducing COVID-19 transmission. These
303 findings provide insights that can inform COVID-19 mitigation efforts in the coming months
304 before the majority of population can be protected through mass-vaccination, as well as
305 control strategies for other (re)emerging infections in the future.
306
307 Lockdown-like measures where confinement at home is encouraged or mandated through
308 school closures, telework policies, closure of non-essential businesses, and stay-at-home
309 orders have been a major control measure to curb COVID-19 spread. In effect, such
310 measures reduce population contact rates and thus transmission. Previous modeling
311 studies estimated that lockdowns reduced COVID-19 transmission (measured by R_t) by
312 58% in Wuhan, China,[4] 45% (95% CI: 42-49%) in Italy,[29] and 77% (95% CI: 76-78%) in
313 France.[28] Our estimate for NYC overall (~70%) is consistent with these previous estimates.
314 In addition, our estimates show that reducing population contact rates effectively reduced
315 transmission across all age groups (ranging from a 51% reduction among 1-4 year-olds to
316 83% among 5-14 year-olds; Table 1). Together, these findings underscore the importance

317 of reducing contact rates through, for example, physical distancing in places with
318 continuous community transmission of COVID-19.
319
320 The use of surgical masks or cloth face coverings has been another major preventive
321 measure for COVID-19. Studies overall have shown that surgical masks could substantially
322 reduce onward transmission albeit with a large range of efficacy estimates across
323 settings.[30] However, it remains unclear the overall effectiveness of universal face covering
324 requirements at the population level, especially during a pandemic, due to several factors:
325 1) The overall effectiveness depends on compliance which may vary across subpopulations
326 and time; 2) Improper use of face coverings (e.g. without covering the nose and/or mouth
327 or improper handling[31]) can reduce the effectiveness of face covering; 3) Face coverings
328 are required and mostly worn in public and thus likely have a lower impact in private
329 settings, particularly in reducing household transmission; consequently, the relative impact
330 of face covering depends on the relative contribution of different sources of transmission
331 (e.g. household vs. community) at a given time and *vice versa*; and 4) Use of face coverings
332 may lead to complacency and less stringent adherence to social distancing and stay-at-
333 home behaviors. Here we estimated a ~7% reduction in overall transmission during the
334 first month of the face covering mandate. However, the estimated effectiveness varied
335 largely across age groups with much higher effectiveness among older adults (~20% for
336 both 65-74 and 75+ year-olds vs. <10% for other age groups). This discrepancy was likely
337 due to the differential compliance and types of face covering used. Observational studies in
338 Wisconsin and surveys nationwide in April/May reported about 2-fold higher rates of face
339 covering usage among older adults versus younger adults and minors.[22-24] In addition, due

340 to the shortage of surgical masks during March–May,[32] older adults at higher risk of severe
341 COVID-19 infection were more likely to use surgical masks whereas younger age groups
342 more frequently used non-medical cloth coverings, which are often less effective[33,34] (e.g.
343 measured ultrafine filtration efficiency is ~50% for surgical masks vs. ~10-25% for T-shirt
344 and ~25-35% for cotton covers[34]).
345
346 When lockdown-like measures are lifted, residents will spend more time outside their
347 homes than during the lockdown. Adjusting for the time spent outside of homes (~8.3
348 hours in April 2020 vs. ~11.5 hours in June-July 2020 and ~13.5 hours pre-pandemic; NYC
349 data[35]), universal face covering would have reduced overall transmission by ~9–11% (i.e.,
350 6.6% multiplied by a factor of 1.4–1.6) during reopening, given the same rates of face
351 covering as in April. However, if the same effectiveness among older adults were achieved
352 among other age groups, universal face covering could reduce overall transmission by up to
353 ~28–32% (i.e., 20% multiplied by a factor of 1.4–1.6). The implication of this latter
354 estimate is two-fold. On the one hand, it suggests that for places with high level of
355 transmission, implementing face covering *alone* is likely insufficient to lower the effective
356 reproductive number R_t to <1 in order to control the epidemic [for instance, for a city with
357 an R_0 = 3, the resulting R_t would be 3 × (1– 30%) = 2.1]. This finding is consistent with the
358 observed resurgence of COVID-19 cases in NYC during fall/winter 2020 despite the
359 concurrent high usage rate of face coverings (~90% of survey respondents in NYC reported
360 always or frequently wearing masks in public in July 2020;[36] and this number was likely
361 higher during fall/winter 2020). On the other hand, our findings also suggest that
362 improving effective usage rates of face coverings, especially among younger age groups,

363 could significantly mitigate the risk of resurgence of COVID-19 infections during re-opening
364 (i.e., ~30% reduction without compromising economic growth). It is thus crucial for future
365 research to understand reasons for the use/non-use and selection of face coverings by age
366 group to inform strategies to increase consistent and correct mask use in settings where
367 social distancing is not possible.
368
369 It is important to note, however, that not all individuals have the same opportunities to
370 physically distance and/or adopt face coverings during a pandemic, despite government
371 mandates. For instance, over one million frontline workers in NYC (e.g., healthcare
372 workers, transportation workers, janitors, and grocery clerks, which comprise 25 percent
373 of the city's workforce) had to continue their essential work during the pandemic.[37] In
374 addition, data from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics suggest Black and Latino
375 communities have less opportunities to work from home.[38] Consequently, NYC
376 neighborhoods with more frontline workers and/or Black and Latino residents tended to
377 have lower reductions in population mobility during the pandemic.[35] In NYC, these
378 communities also experience a number of social conditions that are thought to exacerbate
379 COVID-19, including overcrowded multigenerational households, poverty, and high
380 prevalence of chronic diseases. These communities, known to also carry a higher burden of
381 underlying health conditions, suffered greater impacts from COVID-19 and have expressed
382 fear and experiences of racialized bias when wearing a face covering.[39,40] Further research
383 is warranted to investigate such health disparities. In addition, future policies should take
384 into account structural inequities in labor trends, overcrowded housing, and underlying

385 conditions and adopt additional preventive measures to protect those vulnerable
386 communities.
387
388 We also note there remain large uncertainties in our estimates due to several limitations.
389 First, we used population mobility as a proxy for contact rates rather than more direct
390 measures. Similar approximation and uncertainty applied to our estimates of the
391 effectiveness of face covering. Future studies are thus warranted for further assessment.
392 For instance, large population scale surveys documenting changes of the intensity and
393 pattern of contact during the pandemic could provide more accurate measures of contact
394 rates among different age groups and over time. Second, while we restricted our analysis
395 on the effectiveness of face covering to a period when masks were mandated, there remain
396 other residual confounding effects. For instance, increased awareness of COVID-19 and
397 health risk among key age groups such as the elderly may have contributed to further
398 reductions of transmission through other precautions in addition to face covering; this may
399 have led to an overestimation of the effectiveness of face covering for those age groups.
400 Third, here we focused on estimating the effectiveness of interventions in the general
401 population without segregating key settings with intense transmission (e.g., long-term care
402 facilities). Future studies should assess the impact of interventions targeting such high-risk
403 settings. Lastly, our estimates here were largely based on the first wave of the pandemic
404 and may not fully capture subsequent changes in awareness and perception of COVID-19
405 and related behavioral adjustment during later waves. However, we have also used a
406 similar methodology to estimate the effectiveness of reducing contact rates and face
407 covering under different city reopening schedules and generated long-term projections for

408 NYC; the projections generated during June 2020 for the period of June 2020 – May 2021
409 have been consistent with observations up to the end of 2020 (i.e., at the time of this
410 writing; see the projected resurgence and second wave in Yang et al.[41] and comparison
411 with available data in Fig S7). These results thus support the robustness of our estimates
412 here.
413
414 Our study also has several strengths. In particular, our estimates were based on
415 comprehensive model-inference incorporating multiple data streams and further evaluated
416 using model projections. Our results thus provide an assessment of two major public heath
417 interventions (reducing contact rates and face covering) at the population level where the
418 overall effectiveness depends on multiple factors in addition to the efficacy of a given
419 intervention. Altogether, our estimates support the need for multiple interventions
420 (including reducing contact rates by, e.g., restricting occupancy, universal face covering,
421 and, albeit not studied here, testing, contact tracing, isolation and timely treatment of
422 cases) in order to effectively mitigate the spread of COVID-19 as it continues to pose
423 threats to public health.
424
425 **Methods**
426 ***Data***
427 COVID-19 cases included all laboratory-confirmed cases by week of diagnosis reported to
428 the NYC DOHMH. Mortality data by week of death combined confirmed and probable
429 COVID-19-associated deaths. Confirmed COVID-19-associated deaths were defined as those
430 occurring in persons with laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection, and probable

431 COVID-19 deaths were defined as those with COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, or a similar term
432 listed on the death certificate as an immediate, underlying, or contributing cause of death,
433 but did not have laboratory-confirmation of COVID-19.[42] For this study, both weekly case
434 and mortality data were aggregated by age group (<1, 1-4, 5-14, 15-24, 25-44, 45-64, 65-
435 74, and 75+ years) for each of the 42 United Hospital Fund (UHF) neighborhoods,[43]
436 according to the patient's residential address. All data were retrieved on Sep 4, 2020. For a
437 summary of the spatial variations across the 42 neighborhoods, see Table S3 in the
438 Appendix of Yang et al.[12]
439
440 The mobility data, used to model changes in population contact rates due to public health
441 interventions implemented during the pandemic (e.g., social distancing), came from
442 SafeGraph[35,44] and contained counts of visitors to locations in each zip code from the same
443 zip code and others, separately, based on mobile device locations. The released data were
444 anonymized and aggregated in weekly intervals. We spatially aggregated these data to the
445 UHF neighborhood level, for both intra and inter UHF neighborhood mobility. In addition,
446 SafeGraph also provided an aggregate measure of the length of time spent outside of the
447 home during each week.
448
449 This study was classified as public health surveillance and exempt from ethical review and
450 informed consent by the Institutional Review Boards of both Columbia University and NYC
451 DOHMH.
452
453 ***Network transmission model***

454 The epidemic model used in this study was described in Yang et al. 2020[11,12] Briefly, the

455 model simulated intra- and inter neighborhood transmission of COVID-19 using a

456 susceptible-exposed-infectious-removed (SEIR) network model:

457
$$\begin{cases} \frac{dS_i}{dt} = -S_i \sum_{j=1}^{j=42} b_j \beta_{city} c_{ij} I_j / N_j \\ \frac{dE_i}{dt} = S_i \sum_{j=1}^{j=42} b_j \beta_{city} c_{ij} I_j / N_j - \frac{E_i}{Z} \\ \frac{dI_i}{dt} = \frac{E_i}{Z} - \frac{I_i}{D} \\ \frac{dR_i}{dt} = \frac{I_i}{D} \end{cases} \quad \text{(Eqn 1)}$$

458

459 where S_i, E_i, I_i, R_i, and N_i are the numbers of susceptible, exposed (but not yet infectious),

460 infectious, and removed (either recovered or deceased) individuals and the total

461 population, respectively, from a given age group in neighborhood *i*. Note that due to model

462 complexity and a lack of information for parameterizing interactions among age groups, we

463 modeled each age group separately (i.e., combining all sources of transmission to each age

464 group; see further detail on parameter estimation below); as such, Eqn 1 describes the

465 spatial transmission across neighborhoods without interactions among age groups. β_{city} is

466 the citywide transmission rate, which incorporated seasonal variation as observed for

467 OC43, a beta-coronavirus in humans from the same genus as SARS-CoV-2.[12] To allow

468 differential transmission in each neighborhood, we included a multiplicative factor, b_i, to

469 scale neighborhood local transmission rates. *Z* and *D* are the latency and infectious

470 periods, respectively (Table S4).

471

472 The contact rates (c_{ij}) in each neighborhood over time and connectivity among

473 neighborhoods were computed based on mobility data. The model also accounted for

474 delays from infection to diagnosis using two parameters (gamma distribution with mean T_d
475 and standard deviation T_{sd} estimated along with other parameters) and death (based on
476 observed time from diagnosis to death) as well as infection detection rate using a
477 parameter r (estimated along with other parameters). For further detail, please refer to
478 Yang et al. 2020.[11,12]
479
480 ***Parameter estimation***
481 To estimate model parameters (e.g., b_i, β_{city}, Z, D, r, and *infection fatality risk*, for i=1,…,42)
482 and state variables (e.g., number of susceptible and infectious individuals in each
483 neighborhood) for each week, we ran the network-model stochastically with a daily time
484 step in conjunction with the ensemble adjustment Kalman filter (EAKF)[45] and fit to weekly
485 case and mortality data from the week starting March 1 to the week ending June 6, 2020.
486 The posterior distribution of each model parameter/variable was updated for that week at
487 the same time.[45] This parameter estimation process was done separately for each of the
488 eight age groups (i.e. <1, 1-4, 5-14, 15-24, 25-44, 45-64, 65-74, and 75+ years). To include
489 transmission from other age groups, we used measured intra and inter-group contacts
490 from the POLYMOD study[21] to compute the total number of contacts made with each age
491 group and adjusted the *prior* range of the transmission rate (β_{city}) for each age group
492 accordingly. The posterior estimate was computed based on cases and mortality data for
493 each group, which included all sources of infection. Thus, the estimated transmission rate
494 for each age group nevertheless included all sources of transmission. To account for
495 stochasticity in model initiation, we ran the parameter estimation process independently
496 10 times. Results for each age group were combined from these 10 runs (each with 500

497 model realizations). We computed age-specific R_t, the effective reproductive number
498 during week-t, from the posterior estimates of transmission rate (β_{city} and b_i), infectious
499 period (D), contact matrix (c_{ij}), susceptibility and population size in the neighborhood
500 using the next generation method.[46] We computed R_t, β_{city}, and D estimates for all ages
501 overall as a weighted average of the age-specific estimates with weights equal to the
502 population fraction in each age group.
503
504 ***Estimating the effectiveness of reducing contact rates***
505 The R_t estimates from the model-inference system capture changes in transmission due to
506 various interventions, i.e., the overall effectiveness of all implemented interventions. To
507 separately estimate the effectiveness of interventions that reduce contact rates, we used
508 human mobility as a measure of population contact rate to estimate the changes in R_t in
509 response to changing population contact rates. Specifically, we regressed the R_t estimates
510 from the full model-inference system on the mobility data: $R_t = a_0 + a_1 M_{ave,t}$ (Eqn 2),
511 where $M_{ave,t}$ is the mean of all intra-neighborhood mobility at week-t. We then computed
512 the effectiveness of reducing contact rate based on $\widehat{R_t}$, the R_t estimate from this regression
513 model solely based on the observed mobility. That is, the reduction in R_t by week-t, likely
514 due to reducing contact rate, was computed as $(\widehat{R_t} - \widehat{R_0})/\widehat{R_0}$ (Eqn 3). To test the robustness
515 of our method, we performed the same analysis for individual UHF neighborhoods (n = 42).
516
517 ***Estimating the effectiveness of face covering/masking***
518 In addition to changes in population contact rates, face covering/masking was another
519 major control measure implemented beginning the week of April 12, 2020 when NYC

520 mandated residents wear face coverings in public places. To estimate the effectiveness of
521 face covering, we first estimated the changes in transmission rate and effective infectious
522 period, two model parameters determining R_t, due to changes in mobility (as opposed to
523 masking) using regression models similar to Eqn 2. Specifically, we regressed the estimated
524 citywide transmission rate (or effective infectious period) from the full model-inference
525 system on average mobility: $Y_t = a_0 + a_1 M_{ave,t}$ (Eqn 4), where Y_t is β_{city} or D. We then
526 computed the relative reduction in transmission rate (or effective infectious period) due to
527 face covering as $\eta_Y = E((Y_t - \widehat{Y_t})/Y_t)$, where E(·) gives the mean over the relevant
528 timeframe (here we estimated two timeframes, i.e., 1 month following the mandate and
529 over 8 weeks up to 6/6/2020). Combining both reductions, we computed the effectiveness
530 of face covering as $\eta = 1 - (1 - \eta_\beta)(1 - \eta_D)$. Of note, while mechanistically face coverings
531 act primarily by reducing the probability of transmission (i.e., transmission rate), here we
532 included both the potential impact on the transmission rate (η_β) and effective infectious
533 period (η_D), mainly because the multiplicative relationship of the two variables with R_t
534 makes it challenging to separate the two effects. Nevertheless, reductions in the infectious
535 period via face covering are possible. A recent study on animals showed that masking could
536 reduce the severity of infection;[47] if persons with milder infection experience shorter
537 duration of viral shedding (there is some evidence for this, e.g., from He et al.[48]), milder
538 symptoms in individuals infected while wearing face covering could lead to shorter
539 infectious period of these individuals.
540
541 ***Projections of cases and deaths***

542 To evaluate the accuracy of model estimates, in particular, the effectiveness of transmission
543 reduction by reducing contact rates and use of face covering, we tested if these estimates
544 along with the model could generate accurate predictions of cases and deaths for 8 weeks
545 beyond the study period (i.e. from the week of 6/7/2020 to the week of 7/26/2020). We
546 first projected the citywide transmission rate and infectious period based on observed
547 mobility using Eqn 4; these estimates thus accounted for changes due to changes in contact
548 rates. To incorporate the reduction in transmission by face covering, we further reduced
549 the projected city transmission rate by a factor of $1 - \eta_\beta p_{out}$ and the infectious period by a
550 factor of $1 - \eta_D p_{out}$, where p_{out} is a factor to adjust for time spent outside of the home
551 during each week. To reflect longer-term usage rates of face covering, we used η_β and η_D
552 estimated during the entire 8 weeks face covering was required (i.e. from the week of
553 4/12/2020 to the week of 5/31/2020). Finally, we used estimates of population
554 susceptibility and infection rates at the end of the week of 5/31/2020 to model initial
555 conditions and integrated the SEIR network model forward stochastically for 8 weeks using
556 the projected transmission rate and infectious period.
557

558 **Acknowledgments:**

559 This study was supported by the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases
560 (AI145883), the National Science Foundation Rapid Response Research Program (RAPID;
561 2027369), and the NYC DOHMH. We thank the NYC DOHMH Bureau of Vital Statistics team
562 and EpiData team; in particular, Mary Huynh, Sharon K. Greene, Alice Yeung, Anne Fine,
563 Miranda S. Moore and Kevin Guerra, for data management and provision. We thank Jennifer
564 Brite at NYC DOHMH for coordinating discussions on modeling COVID-19 in NYC and Alana

565 Tornello for amplifying community voices. We also thank Columbia University Mailman
566 School of Public Health for high performance computing, Safe Graph (safegraph.com) for
567 providing the mobility data, and Sasikiran Kandula at Columbia University for compiling
568 the mobility data used in this study. We are also grateful to Sasikiran Kandula, Sharon K.
569 Greene, Anne Fine, and Hannah Helmy for helpful feedback on this manuscript.

570

571 **Author contributions**

572 WY designed study, conducted the modeling analyses, and wrote the first draft. J Shaff
573 provided inputs on COVID-19 transmission dynamics, public health interventions and
574 community responses in NYC and critically revised the manuscript. J Shaman contributed
575 to study design, interpreted model results, and critically revised the manuscript.

576

577 **Conflict of Interest**

578 Shaman and Columbia University disclose partial ownership of SK Analytics. Shaman
579 discloses consulting for BNI. Other authors have nothing to disclose.

580

581 **References:**

582 1. World Health Organization. Coronavirus disease (COVID-2019) situation reports.
583 10/5/2020 2020. https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-
584 2019/situation-reports/ (accessed 10/6 2020).
585 2. US Food and Drug Administration. FDA Takes Additional Action in Fight Against
586 COVID-19 By Issuing Emergency Use Authorization for Second COVID-19 Vaccine. 2020.
587 https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-takes-additional-action-
588 fight-against-covid-19-issuing-emergency-use-authorization-second-covid (accessed
589 12/23/20.

590 3. Pharmacy Times. Pfizer, BioNTech Granted Authorization for COVID-19 Vaccine in
591 the European Union. 2020. https://www.pharmacytimes.com/news/pfizer-biontech-
592 granted-authorization-for-covid-19-vaccine-in-the-european-union (accessed 12/23/20.
593 4. Li R, Pei S, Chen B, et al. Substantial undocumented infection facilitates the rapid
594 dissemination of novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2). *Science* 2020; **368**(6490): 489-93.
595 5. The Novel Coronavirus Pneumonia Emergency Response Epidemiology Team. The
596 epidemiological characteristics of an outbreak of 2019 novel coronavirus diseases (COVID-
597 19)—China, 2020. *China CDC Weekly* 2020; **2**(8): 113-22.
598 6. CDC COVID-19 Response Team. Preliminary estimates of the prevalence of selected
599 underlying health conditions among patients with coronavirus disease 2019—United
600 States, February 12–March 28, 2020. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 2020; **69**(13):
601 382.
602 7. New York City Office of the Mayor. New York City to Close All School Buildings and
603 Transition to Remote Learning. 3/15/2020 2020. https://www1.nyc.gov/office-of-the-
604 mayor/news/151-20/new-york-city-close-all-school-buildings-transition-remote-learning.
605 8. New York State Department of Health. New York State on PAUSE. 2020.
606 https://coronavirus.health.ny.gov/new-york-state-pause (accessed 5/16/2020 2020).
607 9. New York city Office of the Mayor. Transcript: Mayor de Blasio Holds Media
608 Availability on COVID-19. 4/12/2020 2020. https://www1.nyc.gov/office-of-the-
609 mayor/news/249-20/transcript-mayor-de-blasio-holds-media-availability-covid-19.
610 10. Yang W, Kandula S, Shaman J. Projections of COVID19 Epidemic Outcomes and
611 Healthcare Demands for New York City (NYC). 2020. https://github.com/wan-
612 yang/COLUMBIA-COVID19-PROJECTIONS-FOR-NYC (accessed 5/12/2020 2020).
613 11. Yang W, Kandula S, Huynh M, et al. Estimating the infection fatality risk of COVID-19
614 in New York City, March 1-May 16, 2020. *medRxiv* 2020: 2020.06.27.20141689.
615 12. Yang W, Kandula S, Huynh M, et al. Estimating the infection-fatality risk of SARS-
616 CoV-2 in New York City during the spring 2020 pandemic wave: a model-based analysis.
617 *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*.
618 13. Governor.ny.gov. After Weeks of Demanding Approval, Governor Cuomo Announces
619 FDA Gives New York State Authority to Conduct All COVID-19 Testing at Public and Private
620 Labs. March 13, 2020 2020. https://www.governor.ny.gov/news/after-weeks-demanding-

621 approval-governor-cuomo-announces-fda-gives-new-york-state-authority (accessed
622 6/22/2020 2020).
623 14. Johnson CY, Sun LH, McGinley L. In hard-hit areas, testing restricted to health care
624 workers, hospital patients. March 21, 2020 2020.
625 https://www.washingtonpost.com/health/2020/03/21/coronavirus-testing-
626 strategyshift/ (accessed 6/22/2020 2020).
627 15. Havers FP, Reed C, Lim T, et al. Seroprevalence of Antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 in 10
628 Sites in the United States, March 23-May 12, 2020. *Jama Intern Med* 2020.
629 16. www.governor.ny.gov. Amid Ongoing COVID-19 Pandemic, Governor Cuomo
630 Announces Results of Completed Antibody Testing Study of 15,000 People Showing 12.3
631 Percent of Population Has COVID-19 Antibodies. MAY 2, 2020 2020.
632 https://www.governor.ny.gov/news/amid-ongoing-covid-19-pandemic-governor-cuomo-
633 announces-results-completed-antibody-testing (accessed 5/12/2020 2020).
634 17. Government NYS. Video, Audio, Photos & Rush Transcript: Governor Cuomo
635 Announces U.S. Open to Be Held Without Fans from August 31st to September 13th.
636 6/16/2020 2020. https://www.governor.ny.gov/news/video-audio-photos-rush-
637 transcript-governor-cuomo-announces-us-open-be-held-without-fans-august.
638 18. Li Q, Guan X, Wu P, et al. Early Transmission Dynamics in Wuhan, China, of Novel
639 Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia. *N Engl J Med* 2020; **382**(13): 1199-207.
640 19. Wu JT, Leung K, Leung GM. Nowcasting and forecasting the potential domestic and
641 international spread of the 2019-nCoV outbreak originating in Wuhan, China: a modelling
642 study. *Lancet* 2020.
643 20. Goldbaum C. Coronavirus in N.Y.: Riders Ditch the Subway as Fear Spreads.
644 3/13/2020 2020. https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/13/nyregion/coronavirus-subway-
645 public-transit.html (accessed 6/22 2020).
646 21. Mossong J, Hens N, Jit M, et al. Social contacts and mixing patterns relevant to the
647 spread of infectious diseases. *PLoS Med* 2008; **5**(3): e74.
648 22. Arp NL, Nguyen TH, Graham Linck EJ, et al. Use of face coverings by the public
649 during the COVID-19 pandemic: an observational study. *medRxiv* 2020:
650 2020.06.09.20126946.

651 23. Haischer MH, Beilfuss R, Hart MR, et al. Who is wearing a mask? Gender-, age-, and
652 location-related differences during the COVID-19 pandemic. *medRxiv* 2020:
653 2020.07.13.20152736.
654 24. Ritter Z, Brenan M. New April Guidelines Boost Perceived Efficacy of Face Masks.
655 2020. https://news.gallup.com/poll/310400/new-april-guidelines-boost-perceived-
656 efficacy-face-masks.aspx (accessed 5/13/2020.
657 25. Barone V, Marino J. Hundreds pack St. Marks Place to drink, party despite
658 coronavirus. 2020. https://nypost.com/2020/06/12/hundreds-pack-st-marks-place-to-
659 drink-despite-coronavirus/ (accessed 7/14 2020).
660 26. New York State Government. Reopening New York City. 2020.
661 https://forward.ny.gov/reopening-new-york-city (accessed 7/13 2020).
662 27. Durkin E. New York City sees uptick in coronavirus cases among young adults. 2020.
663 https://www.politico.com/states/new-york/albany/story/2020/07/13/new-york-city-
664 sees-uptick-in-coronavirus-cases-among-young-adults-1300223 (accessed 7/14 2020).
665 28. Salje H, Tran Kiem C, Lefrancq N, et al. Estimating the burden of SARS-CoV-2 in
666 France. *Science* 2020; **369**(6500): 208-11.
667 29. Gatto M, Bertuzzo E, Mari L, et al. Spread and dynamics of the COVID-19 epidemic in
668 Italy: Effects of emergency containment measures. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2020; **117**(19):
669 10484-91.
670 30. Liang M, Gao L, Cheng C, et al. Efficacy of face mask in preventing respiratory virus
671 transmission: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Travel Med Infect Dis* 2020: 101751.
672 31. Parker-Pope T. How NOT to Wear a Mask. 4/8/2020 2020.
673 https://www.nytimes.com/2020/04/08/well/live/coronavirus-face-mask-mistakes.html.
674 32. Bernstein L, Safarpour A. Mask shortage for most health-care workers extended into
675 May, Post-Ipsos poll shows. 5/20/2020 2020.
676 https://www.washingtonpost.com/health/mask-shortage-for-most-health-care-workers-
677 extended-into-may-post-ipsos-poll-shows/2020/05/20/1ddbe588-9a21-11ea-ac72-
678 3841fcc9b35f_story.html.
679 33. Fischer EP, Fischer MC, Grass D, Henrion I, Warren WS, Westman E. Low-cost
680 measurement of face mask efficacy for filtering expelled droplets during speech. *Science*
681 *Advances* 2020; **6**(36): eabd3083.

682 34. O'Kelly E, Pirog S, Ward J, Clarkson PJ. Ability of Fabric Facemasks Materials to Filter
683 Ultrafine Particles at Coughing Velocity - for Home Made and Fabric Face Mask Creation.
684 *medRxiv* 2020: 2020.04.14.20065375.
685 35. SafeGraph. Weekly Patterns: Foot Traffic Data To Understand The COVID-19
686 Pandemic. 2020. https://www.safegraph.com/weekly-foot-traffic-patterns.
687 36. New York Times. Mask-Wearing Survey Data. 2020.
688 https://github.com/nytimes/covid-19-data/tree/master/mask-use (accessed
689 12/22/2020.
690 37. Stringer SM. New York City's Frontline Workers. March 2020 2020.
691 https://comptroller.nyc.gov/reports/new-york-citys-frontline-workers/.
692 38. Gould E, Shierholz H. Not everybody can work from home: Black and Hispanic
693 workers are much less likely to be able to telework. 3/19/2020 2020.
694 https://www.epi.org/blog/black-and-hispanic-workers-are-much-less-likely-to-be-able-
695 to-work-from-
696 home/#:~:text=Less%20than%20one%20in%20five,race%20and%20ethnicity%2C%202
697 017–
698 2018&text=The%20data%20below%20can%20be%20saved%20or%20copied%20directl
699 y%20into%20Excel.&text=The%20next%20figure%20illustrates%20the,who%20can%20
700 telework%20by%20wage. (accessed 8/17 2020).
701 39. Taylor DB. For Black Men, Fear That Masks Will Invite Racial Profiling. 2020.
702 https://www.nytimes.com/2020/04/14/us/coronavirus-masks-racism-african-
703 americans.html.
704 40. Ruiz NG, Horowitz JM, Tamir C. Many Black and Asian Americans Say They Have
705 Experienced Discrimination Amid the COVID-19 Outbreak. 7/1/2020 2020.
706 https://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2020/07/01/many-black-and-asian-americans-say-
707 they-have-experienced-discrimination-amid-the-covid-19-outbreak/.
708 41. Yang W, Kandula S, Shaman J. Simulating Epidemic Outcomes under Different
709 Occupancy and Rollback Policies. Posted online on 6/30/2020. https://github.com/wan-
710 yang/re-opening_analysis/blob/master/report3_occupancy.pdf.
711 42. New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (DOHMH) COVID-19
712 Response Team. Preliminary Estimate of Excess Mortality During the COVID-19 Outbreak

713 — New York City, March 11–May 2, 2020. *MMWR Morbidity and mortality weekly report*
714 2020; **69**: 603-5.
715 43. NewYork City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene. NYC UHF 42
716 Neighborhoods. http://a816-dohbesp.nyc.gov/IndicatorPublic/EPHTPDF/uhf42.pdf.
717 44. Lasry A, Kidder D, Hast M, et al. Timing of Community Mitigation and Changes in
718 Reported COVID-19 and Community Mobility - Four U.S. Metropolitan Areas, February 26-
719 April 1, 2020. *MMWR Morbidity and mortality weekly report* 2020; **69**(15): 451-7.
720 45. Anderson JL. An Ensemble Adjustment Kalman Filter for Data Assimilation. *Mon*
721 *Weather Rev* 2001; **129**(12): 2884-903.
722 46. Heffernan JM, Smith RJ, Wahl LM. Perspectives on the basic reproductive ratio. *J R*
723 *Soc Interface* 2005; **2**(4): 281-93.
724 47. Chan JF, Yuan S, Zhang AJ, et al. Surgical mask partition reduces the risk of non-
725 contact transmission in a golden Syrian hamster model for Coronavirus Disease 2019
726 (COVID-19). *Clinical infectious diseases : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases*
727 *Society of America* 2020.
728 48. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, et al. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility
729 of COVID-19. *Nat Med* 2020; **26**(5): 672-5.
730

731 **Table**

732 Table 1. Estimated effectiveness of reducing contact rate and face covering. Numbers are
733 the estimated mean and 95% CIs, in percentage. Note the estimated effectiveness of contact
734 rate reduction combined all measures that reduce contact rates, including school closures
735 and voluntary or mandated stay-at-home measures.

	Estimated effectiveness of intervention (%)		
Age	contact rate reduction	Face covering (1st month)	Face covering (2 months)
all	70.7 (65.0, 76.4)	6.6 (0.8, 12.4)	3.4 (-1.9, 8.6)
<1	53.8 (41.6, 66)	9.3 (-4.2, 22.9)	12.8 (0.2, 25.3)
1-4	51.0 (45.8, 56.2)	0.9 (-5.5, 7.4)	6.7 (0.6, 12.8)
5-14	83.4 (80.1, 86.7)	3.0 (-0.5, 6.6)	1.6 (-1.6, 4.8)
15-24	65.4 (57.0, 73.8)	4.3 (-2.8, 11.4)	4.0 (-2.5, 10.6)
25-44	76.5 (68.5, 84.6)	4.5 (-0.6, 9.7)	-1.0 (-5.6, 3.7)
45-64	68.9 (59.2, 78.6)	8.1 (-0.1, 16.1)	4.4 (-2.9, 11.8)
65-74	55.8 (34.5, 77.2)	20.8 (-0.1, 41.6)	18.3 (-0.2, 36.9)
75+	53.8 (32.3, 75.3)	20.8 (-0.9, 42.5)	16.2 (-3.3, 35.7)

736

737

Figures

Fig 1. Epidemic dynamics. Reported laboratory confirmed cases (A) and cumulative cases (B) per 100,000 population by week of diagnosis for all ages overall and by age group.



Fig 2. Estimated changes in the effective reproductive number and infection rates. Blue lines show the estimated effective reproductive number (R_t) for each week; surrounding areas show the 50% and 95% CrIs. Superimposed boxes (right y-axis) show estimated infection rates by week: median (thick vertical lines), 50% CrIs (box edges), and 95% CrIs (whiskers).



Fig 3. Effectiveness of reducing contact rates. Note the estimated effectiveness combined all measures that reduce contact rates, including school closures and voluntary or mandated stay-at-home measures. Dark grey lines show the observed changes in mobility (right y-axis). Blue lines show R_t estimated using a linear regression model with mobility as the sole predictor; surrounding areas show the 95% CrIs of the model estimates. The adjusted r^2 for the regression model is also shown in each plot. For comparison, dashed blue lines show R_t estimates from the model-inference system, without accounting for susceptibility. Percentages attached to the lines show the incremental reductions in either estimated R_t (in blue) or mobility (in grey).



Fig 4. Effectiveness of face covering in reducing the transmission rate and infectious period. Solid lines show the estimated transmission rate (in blue, left y-axis) and infectious period (in red, right y-axis) using the model-inference system incorporating interventions including face covering. Surrounding areas show the 50% CrIs of model estimates. Dashed lines show corresponding estimates from a linear regression model with mobility as the sole predictor (i.e without accounting for face covering).



766 **Fig 5.** Projections of COVID-19 cases and deaths eight weeks beyond the study period. Blue
767 dots show confirmed cases by week of diagnosis and deaths by week of death, as observed
768 by the surveillance system. Blue lines show model median estimates; surrounding shades
769 show 50% and 90% CrIs. Orange lines show model projected median weekly cases and
770 deaths; surrounding shades show 50% and 90% CIs of the projection.



771

772

773

774

Supplemental Tables and Figures

Supplemental Tables

Table S1. Total number of reported cases and estimated cumulative infection rate by the week of 5/31/20. Case rate was computed as the number of total cases divided by the population size of the corresponding age group. Estimated infection rate was estimated by model-inference system, normalized to the corresponding population size; numbers are median (and 95% CrIs).

Age	Total number of cases	Case rate (%)	Estimated infection rate (%)
all	205693	2.45	17.6 (13.2, 25.5)
<1	515	0.46	4.4 (2.9, 10.5)
1-4	609	0.14	1.4 (0.9, 3.7)
5-14	2646	0.28	10.5 (6.5, 24.5)
15-24	12562	1.28	12.0 (8.4, 19.5)
25-44	64764	2.45	22.7 (16.8, 31.5)
45-64	74833	3.64	23.1 (18.4, 29.6)
65-74	25469	3.64	15.2 (11.4, 21.7)
75+	24295	4.44	12.7 (9.8, 18.4)

Table S2. Estimated reproductive number by week and age group. Numbers are median (and interquartile range) of the posterior estimates.

	Age Groups								
date	all	<1	1-4	5-14	15-24	25-44	45-64	65-74	75+
3/1/20	2.99 (2.32, 3.86)	1.52 (1.19, 1.96)	1.56 (1.22, 2.02)	3.15 (2.47, 4.09)	2.47 (1.93, 3.22)	4 (3.1, 5.15)	2.97 (2.3, 3.86)	1.77 (1.37, 2.29)	1.75 (1.35, 2.27)
3/8/20	2.25 (1.64, 2.98)	1.43 (1.11, 1.85)	1.28 (1, 1.7)	2.35 (1.74, 3.18)	2.02 (1.53, 2.64)	2.46 (1.57, 3.48)	2.49 (1.97, 3.12)	1.98 (1.55, 2.44)	1.84 (1.48, 2.29)
3/15/20	2.14 (1.62, 2.74)	1.63 (1.32, 2)	1.17 (0.92, 1.48)	1.52 (1.13, 2.06)	2.38 (1.86, 3)	1.45 (0.97, 2.03)	2.99 (2.3, 3.68)	2.84 (2.33, 3.51)	2.87 (2.33, 3.52)
3/22/20	1.37 (1.08, 1.68)	1.59 (1.35, 1.89)	1.05 (0.85, 1.29)	0.99 (0.74, 1.3)	1.29 (1.03, 1.57)	1 (0.76, 1.26)	1.37 (1.06, 1.71)	2.58 (2.15, 3.04)	2.52 (2.06, 3.02)
3/29/20	0.93 (0.73, 1.13)	1.22 (0.97, 1.44)	1.06 (0.82, 1.3)	0.88 (0.66, 1.14)	0.96 (0.75, 1.15)	0.7 (0.52, 0.88)	0.89 (0.71, 1.06)	1.43 (1.17, 1.65)	1.46 (1.27, 1.66)
4/5/20	0.63 (0.5, 0.75)	0.74 (0.6, 0.88)	0.84 (0.65, 1.03)	0.53 (0.41, 0.68)	0.77 (0.59, 0.91)	0.44 (0.33, 0.56)	0.62 (0.5, 0.73)	0.9 (0.79, 1.02)	0.9 (0.78, 1.02)
4/12/20	0.56 (0.45, 0.67)	0.67 (0.54, 0.79)	0.69 (0.53, 0.84)	0.5 (0.38, 0.62)	0.72 (0.57, 0.83)	0.44 (0.34, 0.55)	0.57 (0.47, 0.67)	0.63 (0.55, 0.71)	0.65 (0.57, 0.74)
4/19/20	0.59 (0.48, 0.7)	0.67 (0.54, 0.8)	0.68 (0.54, 0.81)	0.57 (0.44, 0.7)	0.81 (0.66, 0.93)	0.55 (0.42, 0.68)	0.49 (0.41, 0.57)	0.6 (0.52, 0.68)	0.66 (0.58, 0.74)
4/26/20	0.62 (0.5, 0.73)	0.62 (0.5, 0.75)	0.77 (0.62, 0.91)	0.54 (0.42, 0.67)	0.75 (0.61, 0.86)	0.58 (0.45, 0.72)	0.6 (0.5, 0.71)	0.58 (0.5, 0.67)	0.63 (0.56, 0.71)
5/3/20	0.66 (0.54, 0.77)	0.7 (0.56, 0.84)	0.78 (0.62, 0.91)	0.56 (0.44, 0.67)	0.72 (0.61, 0.8)	0.68 (0.54, 0.82)	0.68 (0.56, 0.78)	0.6 (0.52, 0.67)	0.55 (0.48, 0.63)
5/10/20	0.82 (0.67, 0.95)	0.71 (0.56, 0.86)	0.75 (0.6, 0.88)	0.6 (0.47, 0.73)	0.88 (0.73, 0.98)	0.9 (0.72, 1.06)	0.88 (0.74, 0.99)	0.73 (0.64, 0.81)	0.65 (0.57, 0.74)
5/17/20	1.03 (0.83, 1.18)	0.82 (0.65, 0.99)	0.8 (0.65, 0.93)	0.73 (0.57, 0.88)	1.1 (0.89, 1.24)	1.21 (0.95, 1.42)	1.1 (0.91, 1.24)	0.78 (0.69, 0.87)	0.81 (0.72, 0.92)
5/24/20	0.89 (0.73, 1.03)	0.78 (0.61, 0.95)	0.79 (0.63, 0.91)	0.69 (0.53, 0.83)	0.94 (0.78, 1.06)	0.96 (0.76, 1.13)	0.95 (0.78, 1.08)	0.79 (0.7, 0.88)	0.89 (0.78, 0.99)
5/31/20	0.79 (0.66, 0.91)	0.71 (0.55, 0.87)	0.71 (0.56, 0.83)	0.7 (0.55, 0.86)	0.85 (0.72, 0.95)	0.79 (0.64, 0.93)	0.77 (0.65, 0.89)	0.72 (0.64, 0.79)	1.04 (0.93, 1.15)

Table S3. Correlation of key epidemiological parameters with population mobility during the week of March 1 – the week of May 31, 2020.

Age	Rt (ignore susceptibility)	Rt	Transmission rate	Infectious period
all	0.96	0.96	0.73	0.54
<1	0.76	0.77	0.41	0.70
1-4	0.93	0.93	0.05	0.65
5-14	0.99	0.99	0.86	0.92
15-24	0.90	0.91	0.52	-0.05
25-44	0.93	0.96	0.80	0.27
45-64	0.88	0.90	0.60	0.24
65-74	0.57	0.63	0.54	0.65
75+	0.55	0.60	0.50	0.64

Table S4. Prior ranges for main model parameters and variables. The spatial, temporal, and age resolution of each parameter or variable, estimated in the model-inference system, is specified in the column "Resolution". Note posterior parameter estimates can extend outside the specified prior ranges. Note this is the same as Table S1 in Yang et al.(*1*)

Parameter/ variable	Symbol	Resolution	Prior range	Source/rationale
Initial exposed	E(t=0)	neighborhood- and age-group specific, estimated for the beginning of the Week of March 1, 2020	300 – 8000 total citywide, scaled by population size for each age group and neighborhood	Large uncertainties, used very wide range
Initial infectious	I(t=0)	neighborhood- and age-group specific, , estimated for the beginning of the Week of March 1, 2020	150 – 4000 total citywide, scaled by population size for each age group and neighborhood	Assumed to be half the initial exposed
Initial susceptible	S(t=0)	neighborhood- and age-group specific, estimated for the beginning of the Week of March 1, 2020	$N - E - I$	Assumed all were susceptible except for those initially exposed/infectious
Population size in each age group and neighborhood	N	neighborhood- and age-group specific	N/A	NYC intercensal population estimates for 2018(*2*)
Citywide transmission rate	β_{city}	Citywide, age-group specific, estimated for each week	[0.5, 1] per day overall; scaled by contact rate for each age group based on contact data from the POLYMOD study(*3*) (averaged across 8 countries)	Based on R_0 estimates of around 1.5-4 for SARS-CoV-2(*4-6*)
Scaling of neighborhood transmission rate	b_i	neighborhood- and age-group specific, estimated for each week	[0.8, 1.2] for age groups under 65 years; [0.5, 1.5] for age groups 65 or older	Around 1; larger variation for elderly groups based on data

Latency period	Z	Citywide, age-group specific, estimated for each week	[2, 5] days	Incubation period: 5.2 days (95% CI: 4.1, 7)(*4*); latency period is likely shorter than the incubation period
Infectious period	D	Citywide, age-group specific, estimated for each week	[2, 5] days	Time from symptom onset to hospitalization: 3.8 days (95% CI: 0, 12.0) in China,(*7*) plus 1-2 days viral shedding before symptom onset. We did not distinguish symptomatic/asymptomatic infections.
Multiplicative factor for mobility	m_1	Citywide, age-group specific, estimated for each week	[1, 2] for <1 year; [0.5, 1.5] for three age groups 1-24 years; [0.1, 1.5] for age group 25-44; [1, 2.5] for age groups 45 or older	Initial model testing showed transmission rates for younger age groups were more sensitive to changes in mobility whereas the two oldest age groups were not sensitive to mobility. For age groups with contact rates lower than the average (based on the POLYMOD study(*3*)), we raised the diagonal elements in the mobility matrix to the power of the relative contact rate (<1) to account for insensitivity of transmission rate in these age groups to mobility.
Multiplicative factor for neighborhood connectivity	m_2	Citywide, age-group specific, estimated for each week	[0.5, 2]	Likely around 1 but with large uncertainties
Mean of time from viral shedding to diagnosis	T_m	Citywide, age-group specific, estimated for each week	[3, 8] days	From a few days to a week from symptom onset to diagnosis/ reporting,(*7*) plus 1-2 days of viral shedding (being infectious) before symptom onset

Standard deviation (SD) of time from viral shedding to diagnosis	T_{sd}	Citywide, age-group specific, estimated for each week	[1, 3] days	To allow variation in time to diagnosis/reporting
Reporting rate	r	Citywide, age-group specific, estimated for each week	Starting from [0.001, 0.05] at time 0 and allowed to increase over time using space re-probing(*8*)	Large uncertainties
Infection fatality risk (IFR)		Citywide, age-group specific, estimated for each week	[5, 15]×10^{-5} for ages under 25; [5, 15]×10^{-4} for ages 25-44; [5, 15]×10^{-3} for ages 45-64; [0.01, 0.1] for ages 65-74; [0.02, 0.2] for ages 75+;	Based on previous estimates(*9*) but extend to have wider ranges
Time from diagnosis to death		Citywide	Gamma distribution with mean of 9.36 days and SD of 9.76 days	Based on *n*=15,686 COVID-19 confirmed deaths in NYC as of May 17, 2020.

Reference:

1. W. Yang, S. Kandula, M. Huynh, S. K. Greene, G. Van Wye, W. Li, H. T. Chan, E. McGibbon, A. Yeung, D. Olson, A. Fine, J. Shaman, Estimating the infection fatality risk of COVID-19 in New York City, March 1-May 16, 2020. *medRxiv*, 2020.2006.2027.20141689 (2020).
2. New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene.
3. J. Mossong, N. Hens, M. Jit, P. Beutels, K. Auranen, R. Mikolajczyk, M. Massari, S. Salmaso, G. S. Tomba, J. Wallinga, J. Heijne, M. Sadkowska-Todys, M. Rosinska, W. J. Edmunds, Social contacts and mixing patterns relevant to the spread of infectious diseases. *PLoS Med* **5**, e74 (2008).
4. Q. Li, X. Guan, P. Wu, X. Wang, L. Zhou, Y. Tong, R. Ren, K. S. M. Leung, E. H. Y. Lau, J. Y. Wong, X. Xing, N. Xiang, Y. Wu, C. Li, Q. Chen, D. Li, T. Liu, J. Zhao, M. Liu, W. Tu, C. Chen, L. Jin, R. Yang, Q. Wang, S. Zhou, R. Wang, H. Liu, Y. Luo, Y. Liu, G. Shao, H. Li, Z. Tao, Y. Yang, Z. Deng, B. Liu, Z. Ma, Y. Zhang, G. Shi, T. T. Y. Lam, J. T. Wu, G. F. Gao, B. J. Cowling, B. Yang, G. M. Leung, Z. Feng, Early Transmission Dynamics in Wuhan, China, of Novel Coronavirus–Infected Pneumonia. *New Engl J Med*, (2020).
5. J. T. Wu, K. Leung, G. M. Leung, Nowcasting and forecasting the potential domestic and international spread of the 2019-nCoV outbreak originating in Wuhan, China: a modelling study. *Lancet*, (2020).
6. R. Li, S. Pei, B. Chen, Y. Song, T. Zhang, W. Yang, J. Shaman, Substantial undocumented infection facilitates the rapid dissemination of novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2). *Science* **368**, 489-493 (2020).

7. J. Zhang, M. Litvinova, W. Wang, Y. Wang, X. Deng, X. Chen, M. Li, W. Zheng, L. Yi, X. Chen, Q. Wu, Y. Liang, X. Wang, J. Yang, K. Sun, I. M. Longini, Jr., M. E. Halloran, P. Wu, B. J. Cowling, S. Merler, C. Viboud, A. Vespignani, M. Ajelli, H. Yu, Evolving epidemiology and transmission dynamics of coronavirus disease 2019 outside Hubei province, China: a descriptive and modelling study. *The Lancet. Infectious diseases*, (2020).
8. W. Yang, J. Shaman, A simple modification for improving inference of non-linear dynamical systems. *arXiv*, 1403.6804 (2014).
9. R. Verity, L. C. Okell, I. Dorigatti, P. Winskill, C. Whittaker, N. Imai, G. Cuomo-Dannenburg, H. Thompson, P. G. T. Walker, H. Fu, A. Dighe, J. T. Griffin, M. Baguelin, S. Bhatia, A. Boonyasiri, A. Cori, Z. Cucunuba, R. FitzJohn, K. Gaythorpe, W. Green, A. Hamlet, W. Hinsley, D. Laydon, G. Nedjati-Gilani, S. Riley, S. van Elsland, E. Volz, H. Wang, Y. Wang, X. Xi, C. A. Donnelly, A. C. Ghani, N. M. Ferguson, Estimates of the severity of coronavirus disease 2019: a model-based analysis. *The Lancet. Infectious diseases*, (2020).

Supplemental Figures

Fig S1. Model fits of reported confirmed COVID-19 cases. Blue dots show reported number of cases by age group and week of diagnosis. Boxes show the model fitted weekly number of cases by age group. Box edges, thick middle lines, and whiskers show the 2.5th, 25th, 50th, 75th, and 97.5th percentiles of model estimates.



Fig S2. Model fits of reported COVID-19 associated deaths. Blue dots show reported weekly number of deaths by age group. Boxes show the model fitted weekly number of deaths by age group. Box edges, thick middle lines, and whiskers show the 2.5th, 25th, 50th, 75th, and 97.5th percentiles of model estimates. Note that deaths among <25 year-olds are combined due to low counts.



Fig S3. Estimated case rates and infection rates by age group. Blue dots show confirmed case rates by age group and week of diagnosis. Blue boxes (left y-axis) show the model fitted weekly case rates and grey boxes (right y-axis) show the model estimated weekly infection rates by age group. Box edges, thick middle lines, and whiskers show the 2.5th, 25th, 50th, 75th, and 97.5th percentiles of model estimates.



Fig S4. Sensitivity analysis on the effectiveness of reducing contact rate by neighborhood. There are 42 United Hospital Fund (UHF) neighborhoods in NYC. (A) shows the changes in human mobility during the pandemic by neighborhood (each colored line). The reductions were substantial in all neighborhoods but to varying degrees. (B) shows the estimated R_t (combining all ages) for each week and neighborhood (each colored line). Note these estimates did not account for changes in susceptibility so as to restrict to changes due to interventions. (C) shows the adjusted r^2 of linear regression model fitting the mobility data (A) to the R_t estimates (B), for each neighborhood, per Eqn 2 in the main text. Adjusted r^2 for most neighborhoods was >0.9. (D) shows the estimated reduction in R_t by the Week of April 12, 2020 based on the Eqn 3 in the main text, for each neighborhood. The histogram is based on the median estimated reduction in R_t.



Fig S5. Projections of COVID-19 cases by age group eight weeks beyond the study period. Blue dots show observed confirmed cases by week of diagnosis (those after the Week of 5/31/2020 were not used in the model). Blue lines show model median estimates; surrounding shades show 50% and 90% CrIs. Orange lines show model projected median weekly cases and deaths; surrounding shades show 50% and 90% CIs of the projection.



Fig S6. Projections of COVID-19 associated deaths by age group eight weeks beyond the study period. Blue dots show observed weekly deaths (those after the Week of 5/31/2020 were not used in the model). Blue lines show model median estimates; surrounding shades show 50% and 90% CrIs. Orange lines show model projected median weekly cases and deaths; surrounding shades show 50% and 90% CIs of the projection.



Fig S7. Comparing long term projection with available observations. The projections on COVID-19 cases, hospitalizations and deaths were generated on June 30, 2020, using case and mortality data up to June 26, 2020. These projections were generated at the time using a simpler model without age grouping but otherwise the same methodology presented in the study. Results were posted online on June 30, 2020 (https://github.com/wan-yang/re-opening_analysis/tree/master/test3_occupancy). Various policy scenarios were tested and here we used the one labeled "sce2fix_asIs" for the "intervention" identifier, which has been the closest to implemented interventions thus far (main settings were capping capacity for all industries including schools at 50%; no shutdown). For comparison with observations thus far, we used data published by the New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, as of Dec 27, 2020 (https://raw.githubusercontent.com/nychealth/coronavirus-data/master/trends/data-by-day.csv). Red line and shaded area show our projections (median and interquartile range) and blue dots show corresponding observations from the New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene. Note that estimated infection-detection rates using PCR tests during June – Dec 2020 have been similar to those in June. However, hospitalization rates and estimated infection-fatality-risk in months after June 2020 have been lower than that during the spring wave; these lower hospitalization rates and mortality risks contribute to the lower observed numbers than our projections.